

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/789,538	02/27/2004	Stewart Townsend	HO-P02873US0	9452
26271 7590 12/18/2006 EXAMINER FULBRIGHT & JAWORSKI, LLP				IINER
1301 MCKINNEY SUITE 5100 HOUSTON, TX 77010-3095			SAYALA, CHHAYA D	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1761	
			T	
SHORTENED STATUTOR	Y PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
3 MO	NTHS	12/18/2006	PAI	PFR

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

			_
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
A	10/789,538	TOWNSEND ET AL.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	C. SAYALA	1761	
The MAILING DATE of this communication Period for Reply	appears on the cover sheet w	ith the correspondence address	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RIWHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILIN - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CF after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communicatio - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory properties of the period for reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by some any reply received by the Office later than three months after the rearned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	G DATE OF THIS COMMUNI R 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a n. eriod will apply and will expire SIX (6) MOI statute, cause the application to become A	CATION. reply be timely filed NTHS from the mailing date of this communication BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on _			
2a) ☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) ☑	This action is non-final.		
3) Since this application is in condition for all	owance except for formal mat	ters, prosecution as to the merits i	s
closed in accordance with the practice und	der <i>Ex part</i> e Quayle, 1935 C.[). 11, 453 O.G. 213.	
Disposition of Claims			
4) Claim(s) 1-30 is/are pending in the applica	ation.		
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are with			
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.			
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-30</u> is/are rejected.			
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.		•	
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction a	nd/or election requirement.		
Application Papers			
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Exa	miner.		
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐	accepted or b) objected to	by the Examiner.	
Applicant may not request that any objection to	the drawing(s) be held in abeya	nce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).	
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the co	prrection is required if the drawing	(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by th	e Examiner. Note the attache	d Office Action or form PTO-152.	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for for a) All b) Some * c) None of:	eign priority under 35 U.S.C.	§ 119(a)-(d) or (f).	
1. Certified copies of the priority docum	nents have been received.		
2. Certified copies of the priority document	nents have been received in A	Application No	
3. Copies of the certified copies of the	priority documents have beer	received in this National Stage	
application from the International Bu	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,		•
* See the attached detailed Office action for a	a list of the certified copies not	received.	
•			
Attachment(s)			
1) X Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2)	4) Interview	Summary (PTO-413) s)/Mail Date	
z) ⊡ Notice of Draπsperson's Patent Drawing Review (P1O-948 B) ☑ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SE	3/08) 5) 🔲 Notice of	nformal Patent Application (PTO-152)	
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>1/28&6/29/05</u> .	6) 🔲 Other:	<u> </u>	

Application/Control Number: 10/789,538

Art Unit: 1761

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over The Nutrient Requirements for Cats and the Nutrient Requirement for Dogs (NRC) references (see PTO-form 892) in view of Paluch et al. (US Patent 6117477) and Coffee et al. (US Patent 4190679) and further in view of Hildeblot et al. (US Patent 3916029) and the "Tux" brochures (cited by applicant, see PTO-form 1449).

The Nutrient Requirements for Cats and the Nutrient Requirement for Dogs (NRC) references establish every requirement for animals in different states of growth, as well as for maintenance. Based on this, it would have been a matter of choice to divide such requirements between "N" number of pieces or provide them all in one piece. Page 4 of NRC for Dogs establishes that energy or food required by dogs is to be based on body weight. Furthermore, it is beyond the resources of the Patent Office to call up every pet food product and count the number of pieces of food that would fulfill N=1 to <10 and to verify and measure the caloric value of each piece. That burden is being shifted to applicant.

Application/Control Number: 10/789,538 Page 3

Art Unit: 1761

The other limitations are not shown by the references above, although the fat, protein, carbohydrate and fiber requirements are extensively discussed in these references. Thus it would have been obvious to determine such amounts. In this regard, see Paluch et al. and Coffee et al. that show such amounts. Those products have an outer and inner component and since they are made from different materials, then claim 7 has been met. The water activity overall is shown as being less than 0.9. In detail: Paluch teaches a dual component animal food which has an outer matrix surround an inner component and the moisture content for the outer matrix (col. 5, lines 25-26). The animal food as taught and described by Paluch provides a unitary, nutritionally complete, shelf stable animal (pet) food product. The water activity of the inner component is within the range as claimed by applicant. The outer composition or outer portion comprises a composition, which includes carbohydrates, fats, proteins and combinations thereof. The outer shell composition includes the amount of protein, fat and carbohydrate within the range as claimed by applicant. [Note Tables 1-4]. Col. 8 teaches that the product can be of any size. Note the sizes taught. Col. 6, lines 54-55 teaches claim 8. Col. 10 discloses the particulars of claim 26.

Coffee et al. teach a textured pet food in the form of a dual textured pet food.

[Note the abstract and Example VI]. The dry portion or outer portion includes a protein, fat and carbohydrate The water activity of both portions combined, inner and outer, is within the range as claimed by applicant. Col. 9, lines 10-25. The dual textured pet food has a soft portion (meaty) and a crunchy portion (cereal or kibble like). The dry crunchy portion has an Aw substantially the same as the soft portion.

With regard to claim 7, Hildeblot discloses a 2-component product, and at col. 3, lines 37-39, discloses that the components are of equal amounts. Note also the water activity is <0.9 (col.2, line 25). The reference teaches that the product can be of any size and the shape can be a bone-shape, which would inherently meet claims 12 and 22. With regard to claim 13, it would have been obvious to manufacture the pet food product in various sizes according to the size of the dog, as shown in the "Tux" brochure. The same may be said of the caloric content for each size dog, as is already recommended by the NRC publications. Also as in the "Tux" brochure, it would have been obvious to produce a triangle shape. To modify this shape into other shapes, such as bone-shape or elongated snack would have been a matter of choice. The following claim limitations could not be compared or measured in prior art products: claims 3, 4, 5, the weight of the product, (as in each piece), a time for product consumption by the pet (claim 17), claims 18-19, claims 23-25, 29, which recite, "wellbeing", "messiness", etc. The office has no resources to manufacture prior art products and assess these limitations by feeding pets these prior art products and assessing them.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to C. SAYALA whose telephone number is 571-272-1405.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Application/Control Number: 10/789,538 Page 5

Art Unit: 1761

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Primary Examiner

Group 1700.